
The New Spirit in Russia

Author(s): Fred P. Haggard

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jan., 1918), pp. 277-295

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738241>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:31 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

THE JOURNAL OF RACE DEVELOPMENT

Vol. 8

JANUARY, 1918

No. 3

THE NEW SPIRIT IN RUSSIA¹

By Fred P. Haggard, D.D.

When it was announced to you that I would speak this afternoon upon the subject, "The New Spirit in Russia," I dare say that some of you assigned me to that rather numerous class of individuals who are said to be always ready to rush in where angels fear to tread—you know their names! And, certainly, until within a few weeks past, any one at all familiar with Russia might have coveted the opportunity to speak of her soul-stirring, world-moving revolution, of her surprising ability to grasp for herself the reins of government and to establish on the ruins of the old autocracy the greatest democracy the world has ever known. Disappointment at the course events have taken, grief in the hearts of all because of the chaos and the instability of present conditions, and despair over all attempts to see a way out of the maze of difficulties thus created, have been well nigh universal. Visions of the new republic have been so elusive, and the changes in her government have been so kaleidoscopic and rapid as apparently to defy portrayal and baffle analysis. One might well shrink from the attempt this afternoon, but for just one reason: now—*now* is the time for every friend of Russia to lift his voice, however feeble it may be, in—I will not say apology, but in explanation, in defense, in expressions of good will, of confidence, and of wholehearted encouragement. It is a poor friend indeed who shouts your praise only when others do, who is loyal only so long as all goes well, but who deserts you at your first mistake, or, finding you in serious trouble, walks by on the other side.

An address delivered at Clark University, January 29, 1918.

277

THE JOURNAL OF RACE DEVELOPMENT, VOL. 8, NO. 3, 1918

We must not forget four facts with reference to Russia at the present moment. She is engaged, or, at least, has been engaged in one of the greatest—the greatest—war of all time. She is in the midst of a political revolution the like of which no government in the history of the world has experienced; likewise a social revolution, the magnitude of which we in America are unable to comprehend, is moving forward by leaps and bounds; and, in the midst of it all, a religious revolution the details of which have not come fully to America is taking place. These four facts, taken into consideration, will help us somewhat to understand Russia.

Now, the only state of mind in which we may profitably discuss and hope to come to an understanding regarding the new spirit of Russia, is that state of mind which is open, which is judicial, which is sympathetic, willing to overlook faults, new or old, and to seek diligently for the good, the true, and the hopeful. A prominent Russian gentleman, Mr. Deboublikoff who arrived recently in New York to make a study of the railway and trade centers of America, made this statement in an interview with a New York reporter: "Russia is too great a problem to be understood easily by another nation, but," he added, "if there is any country in which Russia can be understood, it is America, whose people are fair and broad-minded. America can be just as close to Russia as Russia is to herself." Another Russian has said recently, "You may not understand Russia, but you must believe in Russia." And the principal reason why America should and can understand Russia and should believe in Russia, is that America is very much like Russia. You may not feel very much flattered by this comparison, but this only goes to show that nations, as well as individuals, do not always fully know themselves. We certainly know this, however, as Dr Frank Crane, of New York, has said in one of his terse editorials: "Democracies are always in trouble. And so is everything else that is alive. It is a sign of democracy. The only place where there is no trouble is the grave. Trouble is the function of life, an incident to progress. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' " In the evolution of any truth, there are bound to be upheavals,

overturnings, and quakes. A democracy is a growing nation. A government by absolutism has the deceptive perfection of death. In self-government, a people finds itself, realizes its defects, and learns to mend them. Absolutism never knows how bad it is. In America, congress is always squabbling, the senate always arguing, the newspapers always exposing, preachers warning, politicians denouncing; and we have prohibitionists, single taxers, populists, free silverites, socialists, the A. P. A., anarchists, pacifists, and many other parties and organizations, all criticising each other. No party, even led by Gabriel and composed of angels, would be allowed to manage affairs in peace, because America is alive, surging with tides of strength. The theory of Prussia is to suppress the man who opposes the government. The theory of a democracy is to hire him a hall! This is a picture of America, and also of Russia, for Russia as she appears to-day is a cartoon of America.

But let us come more definitely to our theme, "The New Spirit of Russia," the subject that was originally given, or suggested to me. The subject was not of my own choosing.

I. My first statement will doubtless surprise you. It is this: I do not believe there is a new spirit in Russia. I grant you, there appears to be, but students in Russian history, those who are familiar with the life and the thoughts and the aspirations of the Russian people, find nothing new in their moving impulses, in the psychology of their spirit. Russia, great Russia, is the same today that she was a year ago, ten years ago, fifty years ago. Yesterday I was a flabby school boy; today I am a full grown man, but I am the same personality. A nation of 180,000,000 people does not, cannot, change its character, its spirit, over night. The people may adopt new forms of government; they may formulate new political programs; they may emerge into wider and yet wider spheres of activity and influence, and still retain and exhibit their old and essentially native spirit. Now that America has grown rich and great, has she lost the spirit of '76? Did the imperialistic career upon which we entered at the time of the Spanish-American War involve a change in that something which makes us what we are?

To judge Russia fairly, we must know her spirit, and to know that, we must live among her people, live their life, see them in their homes and shops and in the performance of their private and public duties. It is not enough to study their literature, much less to read about the people; it is not enough to see the representatives of Russia in America, out of their native element. For nearly a whole year, last year, it was my inestimable privilege to reside in Russia. (I wish I were in Russia today.) That year was all too short a time, but it was long enough for me to catch the spirit of a people in whom I have been deeply interested from childhood. What boy is there who has not read the stories of Peter the Great, of that wonderful city by the Neva, of the Steppes, of far Siberia and its miserable exiles, of the Cossacks and of the frozen northland.

But it was through the Russian home in which I lived that I became acquainted with Russian life and character; and I want, now, in the strongest terms possible, to bear testimony to their generous nature, their peace-loving disposition, their intense spiritual fervor, their strong race loyalty, their aesthetic temperament, their love of soulful music, their obvious possibilities in the realm of art, science, politics, government, and in moral, religious, and social leadership. Our experience in that Russian home was of inestimable value. We had been living in a hotel for a month. We were seeking an apartment. Friends advised us not to take an apartment, where we would be compelled to live alone. Reluctantly we acceded to their advice and entered into an arrangement with a Russian family, formerly well to do, but who had lost their property in the war, to share with them their apartment. My wife very reluctantly agreed to what seemed necessary. We could not speak Russian, and they could not speak English. My wife was to share the servants with the lady of the house. The kitchen was to be used in common. We had a separate dining room and other rooms, but there was much in common. After we had signed the contract, and everything had been arranged and we had returned to our hotel, my wife said, "We have made a mistake, I fear. Think

of it—away over here in Russia, we have done what we would not have thought of doing in America; for what woman would undertake to live in such relationship in America? and here we were, planning to live in a Russian home, unable to speak a word with the people!” I want to say to you that that experience proved to be the window through which we beheld the Russian people. We began the study of Russian, but long before we could acquire the language, the people of the household were speaking English. The friendship grew to be a delightful one, and those dear friends are among those whose memories we cherish today. It was through the window of this Russian home that we saw the life and the character and the spirit of those people who are today struggling for their freedom.

There is a Russian spirit. It is different from that of any other people. It is all-pervasive there, and you get to understand it there; but I do not wonder that those who have not visited Russia have difficulty in doing so at this time. My residence in Russia made it clear to me that I had never known the country or the people. I had not known them any more than an Englishman who had never visited America could know the American people from a chance meeting, in London, of a mushroom millionaire from Pittsburgh, or from an unfortunate encounter with a young and blatant salesman of some cheap American device, or from the boisterous conduct of a group of American jackies on shore leave. There is a Russian Hebrew tailor who used to press my clothing in Boston, and who incidentally revealed to me the kind heart and disposition of some Russians, but the Hebrew immigrants from Russia alone do not represent the whole of that vast population. I used to have relations in America with a titled gentleman from Russia, and I used to imagine that he was the embodiment of the qualities to be found in his 180,000,000 fellow citizens. I have since learned that his ancestry was German, that he lived in the western, or German provinces, and that in a very narrow sense was he typical of the great Russian family. And so with the Cossacks. Russians? Yes; but

it would be a great mistake to say that they fully represent the nation. You have heard that slander uttered: "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar." Suppose you did, you would not find anything very bad, for the Tartar belongs to one of the least numerous members of the Russian household, and he is as harmless as a dove. The chief occupation of the Tartars is serving as waiters in the hotels. So with the Lithuanians, and the Ukranians, and the Letts, and the Esthonians, and the Cartwellians, and the Caucasians, and the Korelians, and nearly twenty other distinct nationalities with separate languages. The important fact that we need to remember is that probably 100,000,000 of the population of that great democracy are pure Russians of Slavic ancestry. Of these we know comparatively little in America, and yet, in my opinion, the future of that vast country depends most largely upon these, and I say this without derogation of the other races, particularly our Jewish friends, who have furnished to the revolution a Kerensky and a Trotsky. But Lenine and Trotsky do not represent the spirit of Russia, any more than W. J. Haywood and Eugene V. Debs represent the spirit of America. Such people may be symptoms of bad conditions, it is true, but they do not necessarily represent the generally prevailing spirit of a people.

The spirit of Russia, whether new or old, may be characterized in four words: In the first place, it is patient, involving an uncomplaining resignation to the will of God that is sometimes fatalistic in its expression and tendency. Only such a spirit could have endured the burdens of the old regime. Among all my observations in many lands, I have never seen anything so abject, so appealing, as the levies of raw troops that again and again came into the great cities of Russia. They seemed like hunted deer that had lost the power of further flight. I used to stand on the curbstones and watch them pass by, thousands and hundreds of thousands of them, in Petrograd alone. I watched them in training on the streets. I saw them come at last to the cathedrals for consecration before going to the front. I inquired about them. I talked with some of them. It

was always the same story. "We do not go because we love the Tsar. Why should we? We do not go because we love our government, for what has it ever done for us? Why do we go? It is the will of God." They are a people of great hearts. They will be the first people to forgive when this great war is over. They are the most religious of all the peoples among whom I have ever lived. Temperamentally religious, spiritual—mystical, I will admit; nevertheless, true to the instincts of the inner life. The quiet submissiveness of the Tsar when informed of the revolution was not due to the human odds against him. In his non-resisting abdication he typified the spirit of Russia. This spirit, however, may be aroused to frenzy; it has been in the past, and it may be again.

In the second place, the spirit of Russia is aspiring, for, contradictory as it may seem, the people have not lost their vision of better days to come, nor failed of leaders pointing the way to freedom. John R. Mott has recently said (and I have heard him speak but once) that there are more and stronger leaders in proportion to the population of Russia than in any other country which he has visited. Some one has said that "The tragedy of Russia is her high idealisms. The extremists at present in control of the situation are not malevolent firebrands or German spies, but they are just dreamers, passionately trying to institute an ideal order of things." This statement may, or may not, be true, but the rank and file in Russia are not extremists. They are idealists and their idealism will ultimately find its level, and order will come from chaos. We speak of wild-eyed, long-haired anarchists and nihilists. Doubtless there are some, but they are not typical of Russia. Madame Bereshkovskaya, the "grandmother of the revolution," was an anarchist, but a nobler, sweeter, quieter woman never lived. The people of Russia today are simply floating on the clouds of idealism. This is somewhat exasperating to us hard-headed, practical Americans, but really this fact ought to give us hope for Russia.

The spirit of Russia is democratic. Nothing so impresses the visitor to that country as this fact of universal democ-

racy. I could illustrate it in many ways. You go into the churches, into the cathedrals, and the people, high and low, rich and poor, elbow their way up to the altar. There are no seats. All stand for the service, which is two hours long. The majority of the people who attend are men. Many times I have seen a woman with a shawl over her head and a child in her arms, evidently a peasant, crowd her way past a general and perhaps stand in front of a titled woman. All are on an equality and an absolute level in that house of worship. It is so in the street car and in every public building, everywhere. The names, even, given to all by law, illustrate the democracy of the people. Every boy must have his name formed after a certain model. To illustrate, in America my name is Fred. My father's name was John. When I had to endorse certain papers there, I signed "Fred Ivanovitch." The democratic first name is always used. And the father's given name forms, with the added syllable, the second name. From the emperor down all are known familiarly by their common names, to which are added the name of the father, with the additional syllable "vitch." This has a tendency to put the people on a common level and to make them think of themselves as belonging to one great family. All distinctions are not leveled, it is true, for the present struggle is one of class against class, the proletariat against the burgeoise. But again a contradiction, for even these have lived together on a plane of friendship and common interest not to be surpassed in free America. But the best results had not come from this relationship, and out of it has grown the present civil strife.

The fourth characteristic of the Russian spirit is that it is single. I do not say it is united, or unified, because in view of the present outward manifestations that does not appear to be true. What I mean is that beneath all the turmoil, the clash of social creeds, the confusion of plans and effort, there is an essential unity of spirit, a common purpose and determination, which will eventually result in political harmony.

But what about the multitude of political parties in Rus-

sia? you say. We have many right here in America, and would, doubtless, have hundreds if we had been compelled for past ages in our history, to meet in small groups, unable to compare notes, unable to exchange communications except those secretly carried, unable to express our thoughts in the papers, unable to write books that could be freely disseminated. Thus there grew up in every community of Russia a little party, or parties, and now, for the first time in their history, the representatives of these parties have been able to come together. They are comparing notes. If it shall take several months, or if it shall take several years, for these to be harmonized or at least to create three or four great parties, we shall not wonder. But out of it all will come something of harmony, and the discord shall be put away. A people compelled to meet secretly and in thousands of small groups to discuss their social and political affairs could hardly be expected to come together in perfect agreement immediately. The discord and the temporary breaking up of the nation into different governments will prove a blessing in disguise. Petrograd was formerly the center of everything; all things proceeded from there. All local officials and governments felt the influence of its interfering power. I am not at all disturbed by the separation of the different political units or states of Russia. They are simply learning the value of the doctrine of state's rights. Underneath is the essential spiritual unity which will bring the people together in a great democracy, as surely as the thirteen colonies of America were brought together and were held together, even through the throes of a civil war.

II. My first general statement, under which I have mentioned the characteristics of the Russian spirit, was that the spirit of Russia is not new. My second general statement is, that what is new in Russia is the opportunity for her for the first time, to express her spirit, her real self; for we see in Russia today real democracy. We think we have democracy in America, but we have much to learn yet, not only from Russia, but from other countries across the sea. I imagine that some of you are saying, "If this be true, and

if this that we see or read about in the papers is the real Russia, then God pity her; there is no hope." But such a judgment would be as unjust as would be your condemnation of the small boy brought up in an apartment house in one of your crowded cities, who, when he first sniffs the air of the country or seashore, begins to disport himself like a young colt or a wild Indian. Russia is just now disporting herself. She is rearing and plunging like her own wild horses of the Steppes. We confess to some apprehension. Many things are liable to happen. The boy in the country may break a leg, or he may fall into the river, or he may set the house on fire; but he will probably survive all these, and if he does, he will come out the better for his escapades. I heard, the other day, in New York, an interesting illustration carrying the distinction between an autocracy and a democracy. The one who gave the illustration said, "An autocracy is like one of the old staunch wooden sailing vessels, perfectly safe so long as it did not strike something harder than itself—well put together, able to defy winds and waves, and when you got aboard and the anchor was lifted, you felt happy; but if you struck a reef, there was nothing to save you, you went to the bottom. A democracy is like a raft, well put together; it cannot come apart; it cannot sink—but your feet are in the water all the time!" If this is not true in Russia, it is true in America. I think we shall have to grant the Russians the privilege of moistening their feet while they sail on this great, new democratic raft!

Conscious that I shall be repeating some history with which you are all familiar, I nevertheless think it well for us to recall some of the causes of Russia's condition, causes that will account for her present excesses and explain some of her spirit. There are four words that tell the story, that paint the picture. The words are these: autocracy, social system, isolation, Germany.

Speaking of autocracy, just now democratic America is engaged in mortal combat with autocracy, but let us not imagine that the autocracy of the Central Powers is the kind of autocracy that obtained in Russia. The autocracy of

Germany is well reasoned from her point of view. There are definite objectives, with a maximum of results. The autocracy of Russia was blind, unreasoning, at times idiotic, with a minimum of results. For instance, I was unable to have personal cards printed from my copper plate in Russia, because engravers are not permitted to ply their trade in Russia, lest they be guilty of counterfeiting.

A party of twenty-five of us planned to have a Thanksgiving dinner in Petrograd. All went well, and we were on our way to the meeting place, when some one remembered that not more than twelve people could meet for any purpose in Russia without a permit from the police, and our turkey was held until we secured the permit. And that was not simply because Russia was at war: it was the normal condition in the land. Perhaps in no country was autocratic censorship stricter before the war than in Russia—expensive, cumbersome, a constant annoyance to outsiders and to Russians alike; it nevertheless failed to accomplish its real object.

You have heard of that foreign visitor in Russia who was encountered by an official who said: "You cannot stay in the country." "Then," said the visitor, "I will leave the country." The official asked, "Have you a passport to leave?" Upon receiving a negative reply, he said, "Then you cannot leave. I give you twenty-four hours to decide what you will do!"

The old spirit of Russia was best exhibited, first by her exile system; (no wonder the revolutionists sent Mr. Romanoff to live in Siberia at the very place where the old system was administered), and second by her treatment of the Jews. When I was in Russia, a gentleman by the name of Blank came to see me in my office. I recognized his name, for I had heard of him before. He was an inoffensive clergyman of the Protestant faith, and as I looked into his face, I said to him, "What can I do for you, my dear fellow?" He said, "Help me; I have been ordered into exile. I am now a refugee from the police; can you do anything?" I replied, "I can do nothing that will not make your lot worse and my own position untenable. You must bear your burden until

the war is over.” An interesting phase of this case was that I discovered, before the close of our conversation, that he had a relative by marriage—a mother-in-law—living in Siberia. Said I, “Why don’t you exile yourself and go to Siberia?” “That is a happy thought,” said he. He went straight to the railway station and put himself on the train and shortly was an exile in Siberia!

Not so easy, however, was it for another friend who was sent away while I was there, and for nothing other than a suspicion. He was condemned to go by rail to Irkutsk, in Siberia, thence two weeks by horseback to the far north, to work in the ice, digging ivory deposited ages ago by the mastodons. Frail of body, he could not have lived under such conditions. The revolution gave him his freedom. In Russia, one is a prisoner, even if living in Petrograd. He cannot get away. They simply ordered this man to go. The rule was that he should pay his fare and go to the point designated. Until he did that, he could travel about at will, provided he did not live more than twenty-four hours in one place! He had friends in Moscow and in other places. He went from one to the other, keeping himself out of exile!

But the treatment of the Jews was another illustration of the working of the former government. Their treatment marked the very climax of autocratic hate and senselessness, and it is the very irony of fate that now brings to the front men of that race to vex the souls of those who made pogroms and nameless horrors possible. The sad part about all this was that it was not simply the government, but the church, that instigated and carried through these cruelties and thus denied the principles and undermined the basis upon which it was supposed to be founded. Religious liberty had no place in the old Russian scheme of government. Today, religious liberty is an absolute fact in its fullest meaning. We have no more perfect religious liberty in America than there is in Russia at this moment.

The next point to which I would call your attention is the social system in Russia as helping to explain the reasons for Russia’s present condition. While it is true that the rank and file were democratic in spirit, and there was a kind of

democracy that bound rich and poor, high and low, together, the great hindrance to the development of Russia was the gulf fixed between the so-called upper class and the lower class: in other words, the social system of Russia bound her. When once its shackles were loosed, extravagances were inevitable. A strong middle class, the safeguard of any nation, has been slow in forming in Russia. Russia is strong at the top, and she is strong at the bottom, but weak in the middle. The fact of the revolution proves that this middle class has come to be, and yet one of the difficulties of the revolutionary period has been the inability of the working men and soldier class to believe that one in this middle class could be trusted. The fact that one is of the middle class proves that he has some connection with the upper class, and they cannot trust him. Therefore it has been practically impossible for many who are midway between these two extremes to identify themselves helpfully with the revolution.

I have read today, on the train, in this week's copy of *The Nation*, of the paper, or petition, prepared while I was in Russia, to be carried to the Tsar on a certain day. The paper has been translated for *The Nation* by Professor Harper, the son of the late President of the University of Chicago. I well remember the day. The Duma had adjourned. A committee had been appointed by the Duma, and everybody expected that they would go to see the Tsar and present this petition. I shall never forget the impression made upon me when I reached my office the next day and saw it announced in large headlines in the papers that the Tsar had gone to the front! He would not receive the deputation. The closing words of that petition are significant: "The government," it said, "has brought Russia to the verge of an abyss. Upon you, Sire, rests the responsibility of saving Russia in this hour of her peril." "Sire" did not save Russia. He is today an exile in Siberia. Had he listened, had he heard, had he been willing to act, what a change there would have been in the record! It is not in the nature of humanity, perhaps, to listen under such circumstances. Human nature being what it is, I suppose sover-

eigns, so long as they exist, will continue to do as Mr. Romanoff did. Who can blame these people, therefore, after all these ages of oppression and strife, if, when they find the power in their hands, they shall hold on to it and claim the right to make the government what they want it to be?

In Russia has been fulfilled the axiom that whatsoever a nation, as well as an individual, shall sow, that shall it also reap. If the common people are not considered, are not treated fairly, there comes a time when even the good, the well-meaning and the democratic among the educated and the so-called upper classes are treated with contempt, are distrusted, and find themselves hoist by their own petard. The laws of action and reaction account for many of the abuses of capital on the one hand and of labor on the other. If we have difficulty in America to reach a state of equilibrium on these problems, if there is distrust and counter-revolution here, what may we not expect there, where the first release of the pendulum sent it flying on an arc so long that it has not yet returned? The bursting of a steam boiler, or the explosions at Black Tom and Halifax, are but feeble illustrations of what has taken place in Russia. Victor Hugo said of Napoleon, "He had been impeached before the bar of the Infinite, and his fall decreed. Waterloo was not a battle. It was the change of front of a universe." Something took place in Russia more than appears on the surface. She broke her bonds, and we shall not be surprised at some of the freak results. Let America, yea, and all other nations, beware of holding back too long against the desire of the great mass of the people.

The third fact which must be taken into consideration in judging the nature of the current expression of Russia's peoples is her past isolation. Dr. Hillis, of New York, says that this was more responsible for Russia's condition than any other one thing. Shut in by icebound or otherwise impracticable harbors, she never became a maritime power. Unable to mingle freely with the world, she turned her thoughts in upon herself, becoming dreamy, mystical, impractical. But all the while the leaven was working, the

fires were burning. The inevitable occurred. At last great Russia is free to express herself, and she is doing it with a vengeance and in her own way! We must not be surprised at her antics; she will yet find herself and settle down.

One of the facts that impresses any visitor to Russia is the orderliness of her people. I am sure it will surprise you, if you have not read closely, to hear this. In all my experience in Russia, I never saw one disorderly group of persons. We went into the parks frequently at midnight, for you will remember that they have the midnight sun, and never once did we see any disorder. There was no loud talking, no confusion; everything was conducted quietly and as it should be. The reports we hear now of disorder are exaggerated. If they do exist, they are but feeble expressions of what would take place in America. Think of a crowd of 10,000 or 15,000 persons, many of them young people, going to a summer resort on a bright, sunshiny day, to spend the day and evening there without the slightest display of rudeness, and without a policeman in sight. I witnessed that again and again during the summer months in Russia.

The fourth fact to be taken into consideration is Germany. The papers have not exaggerated the enormity of German intrigue—they could not. They have never told the whole story. It has never been fully revealed. This intrigue, organized years ago, worked its slimy way into every department of the government until, late in the Fall of 1916, when I was in Petrograd, Germany was able actually to break the Russian cabinet, and place in power a man of German name and connections, Sturmer—for the purpose of making a separate peace! Slowly, steadily, surely, the fountains were polluted, with the most humiliating results. The early loss of Poland, the disastrous retreat from Galicia, were due to the same cause. Generals were corrupted. Spies were everywhere. Ammunition was furnished to the soldiers, but it was not adapted for their guns. It had been made to fit the German guns. The Russians with simply their empty stocks in their hands were

compelled to retreat from the fire of the enemy. Again and again they would be ordered to fire say, two shots an hour, when the Germans were firing thirty-six hundred shots a day. Again and again the soldiers were betrayed by their generals. That fact slowly dawning upon the Russian mind, led to the result which followed. These things were freely spoken of when we were in Russia, as was the impending revolution. It seems incredible that in the midst of such intrigue such a revolution could be so planned and discussed. The only explanation of this is that the government desired a revolution, and that it was a part of the original Berlin plan. In any event, the government, through its autocratic spirit, did encourage a revolution. It was to have been a *little* revolution only, in a form that could be easily put down, but of sufficient magnitude to form a pretext for a separate peace. The scheme failed, but the motive was there. All these peace parleys made in Berlin and all these maneuvers planned by the Central Powers will come to naught—in the end. There may be temporary success but the final result is certain.

In concluding this point, I want to say emphatically that in my opinion, based upon much observation and many conversations in Russia, Germany is almost wholly responsible for the present situation in Russia. Of course there was fertile soil. Political mines were laid long ago. The people and the army were betrayed. Lenine and Trotsky are, I think, sincere, but they have been tempting fate in their willingness to play a hand in a game long ago set up in Berlin. Will America learn her lesson and not permit herself to be honeycombed and undermined and destroyed by so insidious a foe? Ambassador Litvinoff, so-called, an ambassador appointed by Trotsky, living in England, says that Lenine and Trotsky, through their maneuvers, have accomplished more toward the downfall of the Kaiser and the Central Powers than all the soldiers in all the trenches have thus far accomplished. The Bolsheviki have at least unmasked Germany. They have lifted the veil, and those of us who had any doubt about the real character of German diplomacy and German spirit should no longer doubt.

Lenine and Trotsky may have taken German gold when they went to Russia—I presume they did; but if they did, they said, “Yes, we will take your gold, and with your gold we will go to Russia and overthrow you.” They have not sought to give Russia away. They do not desire a separate peace, but, with us, they do desire, and they are determined to have, a peace that shall be a peace of the people, of the whole people, for the people, and by the people, and they are not willing to exchange a Russian autocracy for a Prussian autocracy, or a German autocracy, or a French, or an English, or an American autocracy of wealth or any other power; they are going to have a real democracy. And it is important for us to understand now, and I trust we will not forget it when it is firmly fixed in our minds, that the real objects of this revolution are not those which appear on the surface, as the real outcome of this war will not be the things we have most thought about—the Dardanelles, the freedom of the seas, and these relatively minor things. The real point in this great war is the coming rule of the people, of the whole people, in all the lands. For a year or more, in Russia, it was a fact known to all that the socialistic teachings of the internationalists were spreading through all the trenches, the German trenches, the French trenches, the English trenches, and the Italian trenches. Let us not, then, I say, forget that there is much beneath this which does not appear upon the surface.

The last general statement I shall make is that the old spirit of Russia, awakened, chastened, glorified, is destined to influence profoundly the whole world. It has already. It may not be true, as affirmed by Mr. Grasty, the well-known Petrograd correspondent, that Bolshevism is in danger of sweeping westward to engulf all of Europe and America, Germany being its next victim and the United States its last; but this much is true, a new day dawned for the world when the Russian revolution took place. The world can never be the same that it was before this great, this significant event. And even Mr. Grasty’s prophecy may come true.

We have been inclined to be impatient with Russia. We forget our fathers’ struggles for liberty, particularly the

bickerings among themselves. We forget the seven years of confusion and strife after the French Revolution—a period far worse in every respect, than that through which Russia is now passing—a period in which one Lenine after another came into power, each one worse than the one before. We forget how long it requires for *inevitable* things to come to pass—for our women, for example, to enjoy the right to share in our government; and for the inevitable prohibition to be realized.

Whatever the events of the immediate future in that great Russian land, no matter how confused and dark the situation may become, no matter if the Tsar himself should return temporarily to the throne, it has been proved beyond peradventure that the real power and the source of government rests with the people. We knew this in America, but that it could be demonstrated in Russia was beyond belief. Russia, living her own life, will lead the world in doing a lot of new things that, as I said before, some of us have thought impossible. Anarchy and violence can never become normal for enlightened society, but in every excess, every startling innovation in Russia there lies a germ, a seed of right and truth, that shall grow to fruition. The democratization of the armies will help to make war impossible. In today's paper I read of an interview with Professor Ross, just returned from Russia. He said that one of the outcomes of the great struggle in Russia will be the use of the wealth and resources of the whole country for the whole people, the control of wealth for the benefit of the whole community, together with even justice in the courts. Even justice, the theory of which we hold and practice pretty generally here will be realized there. In Russia there has been set aside the old judicial order but she will establish for herself a new type of justice. All these and other proposals for Russia must eventually be carried out there and elsewhere. But is not this socialism? I care not what you call it. I am not a political socialist. I have simply stated facts with which a new world must reckon.

The spirit of Russia is for peace, but she will not finally desert the Allies. If her leaders accept the terms of the Central Powers and make an unrighteous settlement, it

will be because they have temporarily the power to do so, and not because they represent Russia. Woe betide such leaders when the day of reckoning comes. Russia is not a traitor. Kerensky told the truth when he said that Russia was exhausted. He may have blundered in the way he went about making the necessary changes. It is obvious that Russia is not now capable, even if she desired to do so, of throwing her battalions against the enemy. Her fighting spirit is temporarily broken, and there is little wonder. Her morale is weakened, but the people will not again be sold into slavery. They are yet to be heard from, for as a united body they have not yet spoken. They were not consulted about this war in which they were forced to join, but when they come back of their own accord, to punish treachery within and destroy the insidious foe without, they will not be found wanting.

Neither is Russia pro-German—remember that. She has never been pro-German, and she will not tolerate a peace with Germany not in harmony with the laws of the democracy which she is trying to set up. The Russian people, in the exuberance of their new-found liberty, have made mistakes, some of them terrible, all of them deplorable; but, as Count Tolstoy points out, there is enduring hope in the ultimate common sense of the Russian people, in their determined, democratic spirit. Not a day passes that some one does not salute me with the remark, "Well, and what do you think of Russia by this time?" My invariable reply is, "My thought has not changed. I still believe in the final delivery of Russia."

And I pray for a universal faith in Russia. Thus will she be helped, and thus will she be enabled to escape the clutches of the foe. Faith, however, will not be sufficient. We must continue to help her physically, and, above all, by an exhibition of patience that may be sorely tried, but that will have its full reward. Just as we have gained the goodwill of China, not to speak of other nations, so it is possible for us, by helping Russia tide over this trying period, to discover that her gratitude will be unbounded, and the cause of human liberty will be secured.

God save Russia and democracy!